

Kovar et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 09/781,682  
Page 13 of 15

### REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-42, and 44-72 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1-3, 54, and 58-59 have been amended. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 54 is found throughout the Specification, as filed. See, for example pages 9 and 12 of the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the instant amendments.

Favorable reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks which follow is respectfully requested.

#### 1. 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1-13, 15-42, 44-57, 59-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the position taken in the office action. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, the claims, as amended, are more clearly supported by the written description of the specification.

Thus, claims 1-13, 15-42, 44-57, 59-74 are fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. §112, including the written description requirement of §112, first paragraph.

#### 2. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-7, 20-21, 24-25, 27-33, 35-36, 46, 54, 56-58, 68-69, and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kovar et al (5,977,269) in view of Schmittle et al (4,182,848).

As the reference is understood, Kovar teaches a thermally curable coating composition. Kovar does not describe or suggest radiation curable coating compositions containing essentially no volatile organic components which comprise a photoinitiator for catalyzing the cure of the coating composition.

Kovar et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 09/781,682  
Page 14 of 15

Schmidle teaches coating compositions in which a photoinitiator and a poly-thiol are used in combination to cross-link a poly-ene by addition of thiol residues across the olefin bonds. Schmidle recites coating compositions in which the polythiol and the poly-ene are essential ingredients. As recited in Schmidle, exposure of a mixture of a thiol and olefin to a radical generator induces free radical addition of the thiol across the olefin bond to form a thioether. The compositions recited by Schmidle are not suitable for radiation induced polymerization of the vinyl dioxolane end-capped oligomer.

Thus, Schmidle does not teach or suggest photoinitiators for polymerization and irradiation cure of vinyl dioxolane end-capped oligomer.

Even if one of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to combine the Kovar composition with the photoinitiator of Schmidle, e.g., the polythiol/photoinitiator of Schmidle, the resulting coating composition would not result in a formulation comprising a photoinitiator to initiate radiation polymerization and cure of the oligomer.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed herein, Claims 1-7, 20-21, 24-25, 27-33, 35-36, 46, 54, 56-58, 68-69, and 71 are patentable over the combined teaching of Kovar in view of Schmidle.

The Office Action further indicated that the rejection of claims 1-11, 19-21, 23-24, 26-35, 38, 52-56 and 64-65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Schmittle et al (4,182,848 and 4,157,421) in view of Kovar et al (5,977,269) would be reinstated if the language of claims 1 and 54 were amended to remove the negative limitation of not comprising a thiol.

For at least the reasons discussed *supra*, the radiation curable resin composition, containing essentially no volatile organic components of claims 1 and 54 would not have been obvious from the combined teachings of Schmidle and Kovar.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Kovar et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 09/781,682  
Page 15 of 15

### CONCLUSION


Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13, 15-42 and 44-72 is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing discussion. Further, withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing discussion. This case is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant respectfully requests early consideration and allowance of the subject application.

Applicants conditionally petition for an extension of time to provide for the possibility that such a petition has been inadvertently overlooked and is required. As provided below charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105** for any required fee.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the amendments and/or remarks made herein, the undersigned attorney would appreciate the opportunity to do so.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 29, 2004

  
John B. Alexander, Ph.D. (Reg. No. 48,399)  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, Massachusetts 02205  
Tel. No. (617) 517-5555